



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE KARAITE LITERARY OPPONENTS OF SAADIAH GAON IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

15<sup>1</sup>. **Levi b. Jefet ha-Levi**, a son of the famous Bible exegete, is also designated "the teacher (אַלְמַעֲלִים) 'Abû Saïd<sup>2</sup>." The name Abu Hâshim, on the other hand, is based on a confusion with a Mahommedan philosopher of the same name, whose father was also called Abu 'Ali [al-Jubbai]. Levi has composed in Arabic commentaries on the Bible, which, unlike those of his father, were merely short glosses, and hence bear the name נִכְתָּה. There remains of them a part on Genesis (MS. at St. Petersburg), but Levi's authorship is doubtful (see *Z. A. T. W.*, I, 158); and the British Museum possesses fragments on Joshua (Cat. Margoliouth, I, no. 308<sup>1</sup> and 330<sup>11</sup>)<sup>3</sup>, Judges (no. 330<sup>12</sup>), and perhaps also on Psalms (no. 336<sup>1</sup>). I have also already expressed the conjecture (*R. E. J.*, XLI, 307), that the ר' לֵוִי, quoted by Ibn Ezra in three passages (Gen. i. 11, long commentary, ed. Friedländer, p. 28; Ps. vii. 10 and xxxv. 13), is perhaps ours.

More important than this commentary is a Book of Precepts, סֵפֶר הַמִּצְוֹת, composed by Levi, which contains the date of composition (Pinsker, p. 90) 397 of the Hegira (=1006-7). Fragments of the Arabic original are also

<sup>1</sup> The numbers are continued from *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, pp. 209-250. On p. 219, l. 10, instead of 214 read 215, n. 3.—P. 228, l. 22 תַּסְסִיר read תַּסְסִיר.—P. 231, n. 1, l. 2 instead of 242 read 247.—P. 238, l. 8 firstborns read firstfruits.—P. 243, n. 4 read see above, p. 242, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See on him finally Steinschneider, *Die arab. Liter. d. Juden*, § 46, also my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, p. 49, and *Jew. Encycl.*, s. v. (VIII, 33).

<sup>3</sup> The first of these two MSS. originally contained Levi's commentary on all the earlier prophets, as is evident from the superscription given in the Catalogue.

extant in the British Museum (Cat., no. 309<sup>2</sup> and probably also no. 308<sup>2</sup>). A Hebrew translation is at Oxford (Cat. Neub. 857), Leyden (Cat. Steinschneider, 22), and St. Petersburg (Firk. 613, and in the Asiatic Museum, cf. *Z. f. H. B.*, X, 26), and many passages from it have been communicated by Schorr (כרם חמר, VIII, 56), Pinsker (pp. 89-92), and Harkavy (*Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, 1, 132-135). It is from this work that the various quotations among the later Karaites must be derived, and it is evident from them that Levi was inclined to mitigation and was also in other respects of a gentle nature<sup>1</sup>. Cf. the quotations in Hadassi (*Eshkol*, 187 י', 201 מ, 241 פ, and 257 ר); Aaron b. Joseph (*Mibhar* on Exod., fol. 17 b, and on Lev., fol. 15 b; he calls him both times אבו השם); Aaron b. Elias (עין גן fol. 7 b, 17 a, 18 b, 31 b and c, 33 d, 39 a, 49 a, 67 c, 113 a, 114 a, 123 b and c, 148 c [where יפת בן], 163 d, 167 c, 169 a, and 178 b; כתר תורה, on Exod. fol. 71 b and 72 a, and on Num. fol. 26 b); Elias Bashiatchi (*Adderet* preface; c. 5, 14, 15, 34, and 37; ע' שבח pref. and c. 4, 7, 12, 17, 19, and 20; חג המצות c. 2, 6; חג השבועות pref. and c. 3, 6, and 9; ע' טמאה ומהרה c. 10, 7, 13; ע' שחיטה c. 5; הנהגת האדם c. 3; סדר נשים c. 1, 5; סדר ירושה c. 2, 3) and Caleb Afendopolo (additions to *Adderet*, ע' שמטה ויובל c. 6, 13, 15, 17 and 18; ע' בלאי בהמה c. 2; ע' בלאי זריעה c. 2 and 6; ע' בלאי בגדים c. 3; ע' שבועה c. 5, 6, 7, and 12).

Levi did not compose any special work against Saadiah, as he expressly states in his "Book of Precepts" (see Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.*, 2164, and Pinsker, p. 89): ואם באנו שנדבר על כל מענותיו (ר"ל של סעדיא הפיתומי) על ההעתקה וכל אשר עליו מן הקושיות נצטרך לספר מופרד. Hence he indulges in pretty frequent polemics against the Gaon in the book mentioned, and touches upon most of the usual points of dispute<sup>2</sup>. He naturally deals most frequently and most

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also P. Frankl's article, "Karaiten," in *Ersch u. Gruber*, II, 33, p. 20, n. 56.

<sup>2</sup> Besides the excerpts printed, I have also at my disposal copies of many passages from the Oxford MS.

circumstantially with the questions referring to the calendar, but he only repeats the arguments of his predecessors. Thus, he too refutes Saadiah's proof of the great age of the calendar-system, derived from 1 Chron. xii. 33, almost with the same arguments as Sahl used before him and Jeshua after him (כרם חמר, l. c., and MS. Bodl., fol. 4 a). He likewise tries to invalidate Saadiah's assertion, that the observation of the moon cannot have been commanded by God as a precept, as its fulfilment cannot always be carried out, in consequence of the moon not being always visible (MS., fol. 6 b; in *Gan Eden*, fol. 6 a, cited as קושיא רביעית and refuted). He also combats Saadiah's view, that וְהָיוּ in Gen. i. 14 refers to day and night (*J. Q. R.*, XVII, 170), and, with particular violence, the Gaon's rather strange interpretation, that those passages of the Talmud testifying against the validity of the *Dehijot* are to be conceived figuratively (MS., fol. 13 b)<sup>1</sup>. In another passage again (Pinsker, p. 20; MS., fol. 18 a), he mentions that Saadiah reproachfully asked the Karaites, whence they knew that אביב means "ripe corn" and not the name of the month, just as there is a place חל אביב (Ezra iii. 15). Levi does not name Saadiah here expressly, but designates him rather remarkably as one of the modern Rabbanites (ורבר מי אמר מן הרבנים החדשים); but we know from Aaron b. Elias (fol. 16 d), that Saadiah is meant by this (cf. also Hadassi, *Alphab.*, 190 ס seq., who likewise quotes

... ועוד נזכיר אחר זה קצת מדבריהם בנפול המועדים בימים אשר אינם כשרים היום<sup>1</sup> מן המסורה אשר חקנו אותם אחר שעשו על החשבון והם לא בר"ז פסח . . . אמרו בתוספתא לולב דוחה את השבת [בתחלתו וערבה בסופו] (see *Tos. Sukka*, III, 1) . . . ואשר אמר המיתומי כי אמרם חל הוא על דרך רדיפה וכן היה אומ' לו היה יום ערבה בשבת איך יהיה חייב שיעשה יהיה אומר לו וזכרתם מעשה שזכר אותו וכו'. All the Karaites attack this weak position of Saadiah, which they storm with success, selecting their weapons from the Talmudic arsenal, especially Salmon (cap. iv-vi; cf. *J. Q. R.*, X, 271), Hadassi (*Alphab.* 185), and Aaron b. Elias (*Gan Eden*, cap. v, ע' קדוש החדש). Levi also returns to the subject in another passage (see Pinsker, p. 20, n. 1). Saadiah's contentions in the matter, which were hitherto known only from Abraham b. Hija's ספר העצור (ed. Filipowski, pp. 59, 60), are now partly also accessible in the form of fragments from the Gaon's original writings. See *J. Q. R.*, l. c., p. 263.

Saadia only anonymously). In addition to questions of calendar-science, Levi also deals particularly with the Oral Law (MS., fol. 14 a), cites the passage from *Jerushalmi Berachot* (והוא שאמר בתלמוד ברכות ארץ כנען) on the attitude towards the differences of the Shammaites and Hillelites (*Jer.* ed. Venice, fol. 3 b, l. 6 from bottom), and mentions Saadia's objection to the application of the method of analogy (כי הראיה והדרישה ישחית[ו]ן) [העתקה כי כן אמר הפיתומי] כי התורות לא יעשה בה ההקשה כי הפרחים הם רודפות אחרי העיקרים &c. (וכי יהיו העיקרים מן התורות יתכן להיות פרחיהם כן וכו'.

Other points touched on by Levi are: the burning of fire on the Sabbath (Pinsker, p. 90), where Saadia's attack upon the proof from Jud. xv. 5, advanced by all Karaites since Salmon b. Jeroḥam, is refuted<sup>1</sup>; the meaning of ממצרת השבת (see Pinsker, p. 92); the enjoyment of an embryo (MS., fol. 80 a), where Saadia's argument from Lev. xxvii. 32 is controverted anonymously (ואשר אמר) . . . הלא אם יעבר השה או זולתו מן הבהמות במספר תחת השבטים תחשב . . . cf. *Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch*, p. 178, n. 2), as well as the enjoyment of the fat tail forbidden by the Karaites (אליה, MS., fol. 88 b). Here also Levi disputes the views of Saadia anonymously, and contrary to his usual custom employs an insulting expression: וזה הממרה שבקש ממנו פתרונה אמר לנו כי אם תפתרו אותה תרבא והוא שם המכסה את הקרב בלשון ישמעאל יתחייב עליכם להתיר אשר איננו תרבא מפני כי האליה יקרא תרב בלשון ישמעאל . . . ראיא c. 18: ענין שחיטה, *Adderet*, וכו' ; cf. Bashiatchi's

<sup>1</sup> In this verse the first ויבער means "to kindle," and the other "to cause to be consumed," because in both the subject is Samson: hence the kindling and the maintaining of fire on the Sabbath are forbidden from לא הבערי. Salmon has this argument first (in his polemical work, cap. xii), and most of the Karaites repeat it (see Hadassi, *Alphab.* 145 v; Aaron b. Elias' *Gan Eden*, f. 29 b, &c.). Our Levi especially, who elsewhere holds all Karaite arguments for the prohibition of fire-burning on the Sabbath as not sound enough, admits the validity of this one alone; see *Adderet*, סוף דבר כונת החכם רבינו לוי שכל הראיות שהביאו חכמינו 18: ענין שבת, באזור הדלקת הדג הן בפלות וזאת הראיה שהביא מפסוק הנאמר בשמשון ויבער מגריש ויער קמה.

שנית טען מר סעדיה הפיתומי ואמר . . . איך יתורגם בלשון ערבי ואם (תתרגמו תרבא . . . יתחייב להתיר זולתו וכו'.

16. *Joseph b. Abraham ha-Kohen*, known under the name of הרואה (Arab. *al-Baṣīr*), is the most important Karaite philosopher of the older period<sup>1</sup>. He was confused quite early with *Qirqisāni*, and was regarded as older than the latter; but it is now established that he belongs to the first half of the eleventh century, as he already disputes with *Samuel b. Ḥofni*. Of his numerous philosophical and religio-legal works, which have only been partly preserved, chief consideration is here due to his "Book of Precepts," כתאב אלאסתרבצאר (composed 428 of the Hegira = 1036/7)<sup>2</sup>. *Al-Baṣīr* probably controverts *Saadia* often here, but so far only a single passage from a compendium of this work (MS. in St. Petersburg) is known, in which the *Mekhilta* on XII, 2 a is used against *Saadia* [and *Samuel b. Ḥofni*] to show that the present calendar cannot be so old<sup>3</sup>. One section of the *al-Istibṣār* on the Festivals (מקאלה אלמועדים)<sup>4</sup> was translated by *Tobias b. Moses* as a separate work under the title ספר המועדים (also MS. in St. Petersburg), and here also, at the very beginning, is mentioned that *Saadia*'s view, that אביב can also signify the name of the month (and not ripe corn), has already been sufficiently refuted by earlier Karaites: . . . ודע כי בארנו : בספר האביב מהו ומה דמותו (של חדש האביב) על מה אתה תמצא

<sup>1</sup> See on him *Steinschneider*, l.c., § 50 (also my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litt.*, p. 50 and *Goldziher*, *R. É. J.*, XLIX, 224). According to *Firkowitsch* (בני רשף, p. 21) he was not a *Kohen*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Ibn al-Hiti* (*J. Q. R.*, IX, 434, l. 2): . . . ויורה שי מן אלאסתרבצאר אלוי לה: . . . תאריכה פי סנה 128. Cf. also *Firkowitsch*, l. c., p. 22. One section of the *al-Istibṣār* on the law of inheritance (MS. Brit. Mus. 2576<sup>1</sup>; Catalogue, vol. II, no. 591<sup>1</sup>) is dated *Dhu-l-Qa'da* 409 of the Hegira = March, 1019. (Another fragment of the *al-Baṣīr* on the 'Omer, contained in the MS. Brit. Mus. 2570, Cat., no. 596, is probably also taken from the *al-Istibṣār*, cf. *R. É. J.*, LI, 158.)

<sup>3</sup> Published by *Harkavy*, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, III, n. 120. Another passage, given there also, on Gen. i. 14, is perhaps also directed against *Saadia*.

<sup>4</sup> This section is cited under this title by *al-Baṣīr* in *Muhtawi*, see *Frankl*, *Beitr. z. Literaturgesch. d. Karäer*, p. 7.

אותו שמה ועם צחות דבור הפיומי כי אמר זה יבוא כמו ירח בול והדש זו ותל אביב כאשר הוא די מן אשר דברו אליו חכמים בעלי מקרא עם דלות דבורו ובארנו כי דבור שמואל (i. e. Samuel b. Hofni) יש לו<sup>1</sup> חזק על דבורו והשחתנו אותו וכו'.

From the *Kitab al-Istibṣār* must also have come certain chapters that are extant in an Oxford MS. (MS. Heb. f. 12, fols. 9b-44b; Supplement to Cat., no. 2789), and from which I have already published many things (*J.Q.R.*, VIII, 701 seq.). This MS. is dated Sivan 5344 (1584), gives the impression of a commonplace book, and also contains something by Joseph al-Baṣīr, including polemical remarks against Saadiah. In the first place (fol. 9 a), there is a piece taken, not direct from al-Baṣīr, but from a controversial work of Natan [b. Jehuda] against Saadiah<sup>2</sup>. Here some of Saadiah's proofs for the great age of the calendar-system are refuted, e. g., that based on the Talmudic sayings (*Rosh ha-Shana*, 19 b): אדר הסמוך מימות עזרא ואילך לא מצינו אלול מעובר: לניסן לעולם חסר. Then Saadiah's assertion that והיו in Gen. i. 14 refers not to the luminaries of heaven but to day and night—a point that often recurs in Karaite polemics<sup>3</sup>. Saadiah is further controverted in a section on מחרת השבת (fol. 17 a), and especially is his attack on the Karaite argument from Josh. v. 11 rebutted<sup>4</sup>, and his interpretation of Ezek. xlvi. 12 overthrown. From this verse Saadiah wanted to deduce that שבת can also signify Festival, as on Sabbath one may not bring any peace-offerings (שלמים), which are here in question (hence מחרת השבת can also signify "on the morrow of the Festival").

<sup>1</sup> Cf. this passage also in Pinsker, p. כר, who did not recognize who is meant here by this Samuel, and therefore deduced false conclusions.

<sup>2</sup> In this MS. there is another piece given from this Natan b. Judah, which I have also (l. c., p. 703) published, only I overlooked the fact that this piece [and similarly the passage אמר ידי מאורות הוא דבור למלאכים וכו'] are also quoted in Moses Miṣorudi's מצות משה (written 1602): see Steinschneider, *Cat. Lugd.*, p. 246. Cf. also below, No. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the text, l. c., p. 702, with the necessary explanations there.

<sup>4</sup> Ben Zuta also did this already; see *Monatsschrift*, XLI, 205 seq.

Joseph al-Baṣīr replies that one may not bring any private offering, either whole burnt-offering or peace-offering, on the Festival day also, and that hence *ביום השבת יעשה* refers most probably to the opening of the gate (see xlvi. 1) <sup>1</sup> or to burnt-offerings; but that *שבת* never signifies a Festival day.

Whether al-Baṣīr controverted Saadiah in his philosophical writings too, I do not know. I should only like to call attention to the fact, that he too was of a gentle nature and inclined to leniency. Thus notably, he successfully combated the well-known *Rikkub* theory in the Karaite marriage laws, which made it almost impossible for the Karaites to marry among themselves.

17. Jeshua b. Jehuda (Arab. Abu-l-Faraj Furqān b. 'Asad, abbreviated *ġā*) was a pupil of the preceding writer, and probably lived in Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>. According to al-Hiti (*J. Q. R.*, IX, 433, 434), he was also a pupil of Levi b. Jefet and Abu-l-Faraj Harūn. Jeshua developed a very fruitful literary activity, and wrote works of exegetic, religio-legal, and philosophical character, which we shall deal with in order.

As a Bible exegete Jeshua was very important; hence he is mentioned by Ibn Ezra (Introd. to Commentary on the Pentateuch) as a representative of Karaite Bible exegesis, together with 'Anān, Benjamin al-Nahawendi, and ben Mashiah. He composed an Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, together with a detailed and a shorter commentary (the second composed later). I pass over the translation (MS. Brit. Mus., Cat., Vol. I, no. 93) which is unimportant for our purpose, and come first of all to the short commentary, the compilation of which, according to Ibn al-Hiti, was begun Rabi' I, 446 of the Hegira (= June, 1054)

<sup>1</sup> Jefet already disputes with Saadiah in his Commentary, ad loc., see *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 233. It is remarkable that Rashi also refers the words of the text to the opening of the gate.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. on him finally Steinschneider, § 51 (also my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, pp. 50, 51).



(l.c., 434, l. 7: (sic!) ויבא אליו הו גיר מבצות זמא בידה אלכרימה פי שהר רביע אוול סנה 44 ומן זמלה דלך תפסיר ואלה (שמות פי גזוין בכמה מדה תצניף כמא ינקלהם פי סבעה אשהר).

A great part of this commentary is at the British Museum<sup>1</sup>, viz. MS. nos. 310-312 (fragments on all five books), 313 (fragments on בשלח, יתרו, and משפטים), 314<sup>1,2</sup> (on Exod. xxiv. 12-17, and Num. xxxv. 9-34), and 330<sup>10</sup> (on part of Num. xxxii). In all these MSS. Saadiah is not mentioned, but he is in others that doubtless belong to this commentary also. They are as follows: MS. no. 315<sup>1</sup> (fragments on אמור, here the detailed commentary, אלמכסות, is also cited), 316 (on Num. xix. 4-xxiii. 16), 317<sup>1-3</sup> (fragments on Lev.-Deut.; here also the detailed commentary is quoted as אלמכסות or אלמכסות, as distinguished from the shorter one, which he styles אלמכסות, (הוא אלמכסות), and 329<sup>1</sup> (on Lev. xxiv. 9-23). Saadiah is mentioned several times, firstly in 315<sup>1</sup>, whether as סעדיא אלפיומי (on xxii. 5, fol. 6 b), or as ראם אלמחיבה (on xxii. 10, fol. 10 b, in connexion with Sahl b. Masliah; xxii. 11, fol. 11 b, and xxiii. 12, fol. 24 a), or then in 317<sup>2</sup>, fol. 59 a (on Lev. xiii. 30). Unfortunately, only the first of all these quotations lies before me. Here Saadiah's opinion, that שרץ in Lev. xxii. 5 includes also the carcass of a beast, because it is said of the latter ושרצו בארץ (Gen. viii. 17), is quoted and refuted. The expression ושרצו proves nothing, as it also occurs in connexion with the sons of Noah (ib. ix. 7), though it is impossible that the latter could be designated as שרץ. Here Saadiah follows the Talmudists, but the latter deduce the prohibition from כל (see *Sifra*, ad loc.), which is likewise wrong<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Parts of Jeshua's Commentary are also in MS. in St. Petersburg, see *Z. A. T. W.*, I, 158.

<sup>2</sup> To the short commentary belong perhaps also the compendious explanation of the Decalogue translated by Tobias (*Cat. Leyden*, 26<sup>1</sup>); see Steinschneider, l. c., no. 2. Of the comprehensive commentary the part on Leviticus was perhaps in the hands of Hadassi, who designates it (*Alphab.* 33, ה) as ויקרא דגורל. In any case, we cannot take it to be Jefet's

Much more interesting than the short commentary is the detailed one, of which a fragment on Lev. xi. 37-44 has likewise been preserved in the British Museum (no. 318<sup>2</sup>, fol. 31-80), and of which I have already edited many passages (see *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 682 seq.; *R. É. J.*, XLV, 54 seq.). Here also occurs (fol. 75 b) the date, the 5 Rajab, 442 of the Hegira (= Nov. 23, 1050), so that G. Margoliouth's view that Jeshua is the author also agrees chronologically, apart from various internal grounds<sup>1</sup> (cf. also Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, 1, 192, n. 1). In this fragment polemics are several times indulged in against Saadiah, whether under the name of אלפיומי or הוא אלרנל (once, fol. 59 a, also as הוא אלמתעבם, and another time, fol. 59 b, as הוא אלנכסאן), viz. on xi. 37 (fol. 35 b-36 a; unfortunately I do not possess this passage), 38 (fol. 44 a-47 a), 40 (fol. 53 a-50 b), and 43 (fol. 70 a-77 b). In all these passages there is a discussion about the explanation of the verses in question, hence about various questions from the province of the purity laws. Jeshua quotes the views of Saadiah from his commentary on these verses (see fol. 72 b: וקד רכר אלפיומי . . . מא לא יצח מעהא ינסב אלי אלאואיל שיא חכאה פי תפסיר הוא (אלפסוק), whereat he abridged the words of the Gaon (see fol. 44 a: . . . ובעד הוא אלביאן פאדכר לך קול אלפיומי לא בלפטה: fol. 46 a: הוא מכחצר: fol. 46 a: בל אונר אנראצה פי מא יתעלק בהדין אלפסוקין הוא קאל בעד שי אכתצרתה: fol. 55 b: בלאמה פי הוא אלמוצע &c.). As the abbreviated statement of Saadiah occupies sufficient

commentary on Leviticus, nor can ויקרא הגדול אוצר נחמד be regarded as one book (so Bacher, *Monatsschrift*, XL, 122, n. 4), as the אוצר נחמד is a work of Tobias (see below No. 27), and Alphab. 98, 1 is separately mentioned.— ויקרא הגדול would therefore form an analogy to the בראשית רבא soon to be mentioned.

<sup>1</sup> See *J. Q. R.*, XI, 209 seq. Another argument of Margoliouth for the authorship of Jeshua, namely, the citing of a מסלה מפרדה, is, however, of no importance. In the first place, the title of a work is hardly to be understood by it, and secondly, that portion of the Leyden MS. 41<sup>1</sup>, in which is also cited a שאלה מפרדה (see Steinschneider, *Cat. Lugd.*, p. 172), belongs not to Jeshua but to Joseph al-Baṣīr or Tobias. See Frankl, *Beitr. z. Literaturgesch. d. Karäer*, p. 7; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 454.

space, it follows that his detailed commentary was used here<sup>1</sup>. The refutation of Jeshua is also fairly circumstantial, but without any passion. He twice quotes the explanation of the *Sifrā in extenso*<sup>2</sup> (fol. 53 a: והאוכל מנבלתה יכבס בן זון קאל אלאולון יכול תהי נבלת בהמה [מ]טמאה בנדרים בבית הבליעה . . . מה האוכל כוית אף הנוגע והנושא כוית, see *Sifrā*, ed. Weiss, fol. 57 a; then fol. 70 a: וכל השרץ השורץ על הארץ להוציא את שבכלים . . . הא מה אני מקיים לא יאכלו [לחייב] (see *ibid.*), translates and explains it, adds the explanation of the Saadiah based on that of the *Sifrā*, and shows that the Gaon does not follow the *Sifrā* correctly. He likewise reproaches Saadiah with the habit of accusing 'Anān of ignorance and the lack of insight (fol. 46 b: וכן שאנה הו אן יתעקב עאנאן רח אללה ויסמיה נאהלא וינסבה אלי קלה אלך). In connexion with the explanation of verse 43 (fol. 75 b), general canons of Bible exegesis are also discussed, and Saadiah's principles are combated. But here Jeshua already borders on the province of dogmatics.

<sup>1</sup> This MS. may thus also contribute to the knowledge of this lost commentary of Saadiah. I should like to call particular attention to a specially interesting passage on v. 40 (fol. 54). Here Saadiah tries to show that בהמה very often means all beasts, hence birds also. This is the case also in Exod. xx. 10, whence it is forbidden to send forth carrier pigeons on the Sabbath: . . . פמנה שריעה אלסבה אלמקול פיהא אתה ובך ובך עבך ואמתך ובהמת . . . ואנה לא בך מן רכול אלמאיר פיהא ולולך הרמה בעלה אלחמאם באלכחב יום אלסבה.

<sup>2</sup> In both these places the *Sifrā* is not named, but the opinion contained in it is designated as that of the אלאולון. On the other hand, we read in another passage (fol. 73 a): . . . פהו אלדי קלמא אנה (אי אלפיומי) ילאף מא זכרה: תורה כהנים אלך.

<sup>3</sup> In another passage (fol. 55 a) Jeshua relates how Saadiah drives to an absurdity 'Anān's opinion that a new-born animal causes impurity only after its eighth birthday (cf. *R. E. J.*, XLV, 57 seq.), and asserts that the founder of Karaism probably misunderstood the words of the Talmudists (*Sifrā*, ad loc.; *Sabbath*, 136 a), which he thought to turn into the opposite: הם חזי (אי אלפיומי) מרהב ען וסמאה כארגיא ואשב פ אלחנףך בה. ופי אורף עליה פי קולה מן ולר אלבהמה אלצניר לא ינם אלי אן המצי עליה המאנה איום . . . הם קאל בעד שי אכתרתה ואחב אן אלאמר אלדי אגשה חתי ארעה הוא הו אנה כמע אלחכמים יקולן להביא בן שמונה פחלם הו אנהם ארארו אבן המאנה איום פכנס הו וקאל להוציא בן שמונה ולם יעלם אנהם אנמא קצרו אלי בן שמונה חרשים אלך.

A part of this long commentary of Jeshua consists perhaps of the work *בראשית רבא*, known only in Hebrew translation, the beginning of which (on the pericope Bereshit and beginning of Noah) has been preserved in a Leyden MS. (no. 41<sup>2</sup>). In any case, this MS. has more the character of philosophical and theological homilies on the pericopes mentioned than that of a commentary. The philosophic-dogmatic part has been thoroughly analysed by Schreiner (*Studien über Jeschua b. Jehuda*, Berlin, 1900, pp. 25 seq.), and here Saadiah is not mentioned. On the other hand, in those passages in which Jeshua treats of the calendar (especially fols. 86-92) the Gaon is often controverted. Thus, the Karaite proof for the duty of the observation of the moon, from Gen. i. 14, is especially treated at length, and then Saadiah's view, repeatedly quoted here too, that *והי* in this verse refers to "day and night," is refuted on four grounds (fol. 88 a, b). On fol. 89 b, Saadiah's proof for the great age of the calendar system, derived from 1 Chron. xii. 33, is likewise refuted on various grounds (see the text, *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 247, n. 1). In a section on the *Molad* (fol. 90 a: [אם אמר =] שער א"א בארו דרבי הרבנים ודחותיהם האומ' במולד) is quoted Saadiah's assertion that the permanent calendar comes quite near to the *Molad*, but does not quite agree with it (ואולם הפיתומי אמר בעבורם כי חשבונם קרוב במולד ואיננו באמת על המולד). Further, several proofs for the great age of the calendar are quoted anonymously, and combated (fol. 91 a). But they are all derived from Saadiah, e.g. the proof from 1 Sam. xx. 18 פונה אחרת דבר יהונתן מחר חדש יורה על היותם יודעים בו קורם ראית (הירח, cf. *Gan Eden*, fol. 5 c), then the objection why God did not expressly command the observation of the moon פונה אחרת אלו צוה אותנו הקב"ה בירח היה חוב לפצוח [= פסח] בו בתורה (באש' יאמ' הברילו בין חדשיכם בירח, cf. *ibid.* 6 a), &c.

Not less important than as a Bible exegete and dogmatic philosopher is Jeshua as a teacher of the law. But the only thing preserved is the Hebrew translation of a work on incest, *ספר העריות* (MS. in Leyden, Cod. Warner 41<sup>16</sup>,

and in St. Petersburg) which, according to Steinschneider, probably forms part of a comprehensive work on all the precepts, bearing the title ספר הישר. It is most likely the same work that Jeshua himself quotes in his short commentary (MS. Brit. Mus. 2544, Cat., no. 310, fol. 165 a; cf. *J. Q. R.*, XI, 197) as (read אלערוות אלערויות) וואבאח אלמסאל פי אלערוות (אלערויות) and which Samuel al-Magribi (see Neubauer, *Aus d. Petersb. Bibl.*, p. 114) quotes as באלמסאל ואלואבאח <sup>1</sup>. In this ספר העריות there is quoted a rather long passage from Saadiah, perhaps out of his treatise on the same subject (see *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 215, n. 3, edited by Steinschneider in מנחם III, 76, and partly in *Cat. Bodl.*, 2163; then by Müller in Saadiah's *Œuvres*, IX, 171), but without any polemics. This passage bears the superscription שער אחר שנויות, and is introduced by the words : וכבר נראה לי אחר זה : לזכור אשר אמר אותו סעדיא ראש הישיבה בפתרון העריות מן ספור הנשים האסורות משום היותו יודע בחפץ הראשונים בדברים ויתר ועדוף להבין ממנו <sup>2</sup>. אשר לא יבין אותו וזולתו ממי לא נתעסק בו מי קרא דבריהם. If these words emanate from Jeshua himself (and not from the translator) they would show that he also knew how to treat his opponents with esteem. In other places also Jeshua's mode of expression in his polemics, apart from a few exceptions, is free from animosity and personality.

18. Sahl b. Faql al-Tustari (or al-Dustari, Heb. Jashar b. Hased) is a fertile Karaite author, who has hitherto been little known. He is quoted, so far as we are at present

<sup>1</sup> Cf. on the העריות ס', Steinschneider, *Cat. Lugd.*, pp. 190 seq. and *Die arab. Liter. d. Juden*, pp. 92, 93, as well as Schreiner, l. c., pp. 68 seq. The latter has also edited the introduction to the העריות ס' (after Cod. Leyden) as an appendix to his work. Other excerpts have been published by Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, 1, 90 seq., and a full edition is prepared by Markon. The fragment, MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2497<sup>3</sup>, which, according to Margoliouth (*J. Q. R.*, XI, 213 seq.; Cat. I, no. 314<sup>3</sup>), should form a part of the Arabic original of Jeshua's work, is actually a remnant of Solomon ha-Nasi's איצירות. See my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, pp. 51 seq.

<sup>2</sup> The excerpt from Saadiah forms the conclusion of such a one from another Rabbanite work in Hebrew, which, according to Neubauer (*Israel. Letterbode*, IV, 55 seq.), is taken from the דלכות ראו.

aware, by Melammed Fâdil in his Siddur as ישר בן חסד אל חלוק הקראים והרבנים and by the author of the ישר בן חסד as ישר בן חסד (see *Monatsschrift*, XLI, 189). His period cannot easily be determined, but, according to Steinschneider (*Arab. Lit. d. Juden*, § 69; also *ibid.*, p. 342), his place of birth (Tustar in Persia)<sup>1</sup>, and the contents of his works, soon to be mentioned, appear to show that he belongs to the older Karaites. This is confirmed by the statement of al-Hiti, who follows Jashar with Solomon b. Mubâarak b. Ṣagîr, the author of a lexicon כ' אלתייסר (MS. in St. Petersburg, see *Z. A. T. W.*, I, 158), and the latter with 'Ali b. Sulejmân (*J. Q. R.*, IX, 435: הם אלשיך שלמה בן מברך בן צעיר צאבה או צאחב: . . . (אלתייסר הם אלשיך עלי בן שלמה צאחב אלגרון אלמכתצר). As the last named probably flourished at the beginning of the twelfth century<sup>2</sup>, Sahl must have written about the middle of the eleventh century, and have been a contemporary of Jeshua. Of his writings there have been preserved fragments of a commentary on the Pentateuch in St. Petersburg (see *Z. A. T. W.*, I. c.), and extracts of two philosophical works—אלתוריה עלי אלתוהיר ואלערל (Glosses on monotheism and justice) and לתחריר לכתאב אריסטו פי מא בער אלטביע (Critical remodelling of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle)—in a Brit. Mus. MS. (Or. 2572). According to Ibn al-Hiti (l. c.) Jashar b. H̱esed also composed other works, and wrote polemics against Saadiah: ואלשיך ישר בן חסד בן ישר אלדסתרי: רח את כאן מן אלעלמא אלכבאר ולה כתאב אלתוהיר פי עלם אלכלאם פי אלפאזהם ובראהיהם ור' עלי אלפיומי איצא ולה כתאב פי אלאעתדאל

<sup>1</sup> Our Jashar b. H̱esed is probably also meant by the al-Dustari who is cited in an Arabic compilation on Deuteronomy of the year 1351 (see below, No. 38, and *Semitic Studies in Memory of Dr. Kohut*, p. 436, n. 3).

<sup>2</sup> According to Steinschneider (l. c., § 180), 'Ali hardly lived before the middle of the twelfth century. On the other hand, it must be observed that in his commentary on the Pentateuch (of which there are fragments on Numbers and Deuteronomy in MS. Brit. Mus., Cat., no. 309<sup>1</sup>), he compiles only from Karaite authors of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Hence he most probably belongs to the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century.

1. וכתב כחירא מן אלפכה אלמרכל. At any rate, it cannot be clearly ascertained from these words whether the controversy with Saadiah was contained in אלתלויה ב' or in a separate work. Should the former be the case (and perhaps the extracts in the British Museum could confirm this), then Sahl would have combated Saadiah's philosophical views.

With Jeshua (and possibly Jashar b. H̄esed) there closes the specific Arabic period of the older Karaite literature, and I therefore here append a few anonymous authors who wrote in Arabic, and whose period cannot be determined without difficulty, owing to the fragmentary character of the pieces preserved. But they probably all belong to the first half of the eleventh century, which does not exclude the possibility of many being identical with those already mentioned. These *anonyma* are as follows:

19. The Geniza-fragment, *Saadyana*, ed. Schechter, No. X, forms a remnant of a Karaite polemic treatise against Saadiah (אלפיומי). It deals with the observation of the moon and the calculation of the calendar; and from facts that have been handed down in the Talmud (*Rosh ha-Shanah*, 21 b : בחבר ועל תשרי בלבד) and in the Tosefta (*ibid.*, II, 1 : מעשה ברבי : נהוראי וכי), it is shown that they cannot possibly be regarded as purely theoretical cases, as Saadiah asserts<sup>2</sup>. Similarly, the Gaon's well-known statement is combated that the observation of the moon was introduced only with the advent of Sadok and Boethos, in order to fortify the calculation that generally prevailed hitherto. This statement, he declares, has no basis whatever in the writings of the Rabbis (fol. 1 v°, l. 6 : כחב פי סאיר לא אצל לה פי סאיר כחב).

<sup>1</sup> These titles are difficult to identify exactly, see Steinschneider, p. 342, and on אלתלויה and אלאסרואל my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, pp. 15 and 59 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Saadyana*, p. 35, fol. 1<sup>ro</sup>, l. 7 : פהזה ואשבאחה יבשל קול מן יקול אנה מביאליה : . . . לאן מא יקאל פיה מעשה פהז לבר שי כאן פלץ פקד בשל בודה אלמעשים קול מן יקול . . . אן הדה אלאבאר מביאליה. As a matter of fact, in the discussion of such cases Saadiah uses the expression מביאליה. See *J. Q. R.*, X, 263, 271.

והוא כבר כדב לאנה לא יוגר הוא אלכבר פי : fol. 2 r<sup>o</sup>, l. 9 ; ארבראני (סאיר כתב ארבראני ואזא כאן אלכבר עלי הוא בטל אן יכונ לה אצל).

20. A Geniza-fragment in Cambridge, belonging to the Taylor-Schechter Collection (Ar. T.-S. 30), six leaves<sup>1</sup>, 18 × 13 cm., contains a remnant of an old Karaite Law-book. The book was apparently divided up into sections (מקאלות), and each section into chapters (פצול). The superscription of such a chapter has been preserved (fol. 2 r<sup>o</sup> : אלה תשקצו : מן העוף), and then the following sections are incidentally quoted : on the Sabbath (מקאלה אלסבת ; fol. 3 v<sup>o</sup>, 5 v<sup>o</sup>), on the ripening of spring (מקאלה אלאביב, fol. 3 v<sup>o</sup>), and on [the enjoyment of] hens (מקאלה ארנא ; fol. 5 v<sup>o</sup>)<sup>2</sup>. In addition, the author cites his work כתאב אלשכוך (fol. 4 r<sup>o</sup>), which is otherwise also unknown. In another passage (fol. 6 r<sup>o</sup>), 'Anân's views (known from another source too) about the characteristics of permitted fowls, which differ entirely from those given in the Talmud (*Hullin*, 61 a), is cited. Our author states that Saadiah combated this view of 'Anân, and remarks that the refutation of the Fayyumite is directed against him personally, i. e. against the Rabbanite characteristics : ולאן האלתהם (אי האלה ארבראניין) תגרי מגרי האלה ענן פי קו' אן אלטאהר הו מא יוֹק ויִמֵּל . . . וקר רד' עליה אלפיומי במא לא מעני לה והו קולה אן פי אלוֹק ואלמֵּל ירגע אלי אלפעל ואנה לא ינוז לא יכונ עלאמה אלמטלק אלא מא ירגע אלי גסרה אלך. I reserve a full consideration of the subject-matter treated of here till I have an opportunity of publishing the whole fragment, but cf. Harkavy, l. c., 154.

21. Another fragment of the same collection (so far without any press-mark), two small leaves, paper, deals with questions of calendar-science, holding that if the

<sup>1</sup> There is a gap between leaves 3 and 4.

<sup>2</sup> 'Anân is known to have forbidden their enjoyment, maintaining that the hen is identical with the biblical רוכסא (see Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, 1, 145, n. 5). In our fragment (fol. 3 v<sup>o</sup>) this view of 'Anân is also quoted and likewise that of the sectarian Mālik al-Ramli (see *ibid.*).



new moon is invisible through some cause or other, the 31st day must be adopted as the day of new moon<sup>1</sup>. The unknown Karaite author adduces as examples the cities of Tiberias and Ramla<sup>2</sup>: he must therefore have been a Palestinian. He furthermore cites the following argument of the Karaites for the above view: Just as even a death-sentence follows upon the declaration of witnesses, although the certainty is never present that these witnesses have not lied, so the 31st day can hold good as the day of New Moon, even though it is quite possible this actually occurred already on the 30th. He then says that Saadiah tried to refute this analogy (ועם אלפיומי אנה ניר קיאם צחיה פקאל וגרת) and shows that this analogy holds true nevertheless (ועם אלפיומי אן בינהמא פרק ברעוי אדעאה לא) (אצל לה ונחן נורי אלחופיק בינהמא אלך).

22. MS. Bodl. Heb. e 32, fols. 9-18 (Supplement to Cat., no. 2631<sup>2</sup>), contains a fragment of an Arabic commentary on Gen. iv and vi, mostly in the form of questions and answers. Its Karaite character is evident from the following passage (fol. 13): וראינא ראם אלמתיבה קד אלום אלנרה ז נקיים<sup>3</sup>. It is well known that the duration and the degree of the impurity of a woman with child forms a subject of dispute between Rabbanites and Karaites, inasmuch as the latter also forbid any sexual intercourse during the thirty-three days after the birth of a boy and the sixty-six days after the birth of a girl (see

<sup>1</sup> This question is also discussed elsewhere in Karaite literature, most fully by Jefet in his *Comm. on Gen.*, VIII, 3; see *J. Q. R.*, X, 241.

<sup>2</sup> The interesting passage reads as follows, *in extenso*: קד . . . וכמא אנה קד יתקן גים פי מדינה שבריה ענד גיבובא אלשמם ויכון צחו פי מדינה אורמלה פי דלך אלוקת בעינה פיתחון אהל אורמלה אליום ויתחנן אהל שבריה פי גר ואכל חחת נץ אלחחאב (Lev. xii. 3) וביום השמיני ימול כדאך נקול איצא אנה אן רם אלהאל באורמלה ולא יורא בשבריה יב עלי אהל אורמלה אן יתחדקן דלך אליום ואהל שבריה יתחדקו פי אליום אלהאני ואכל חחת נץ (Num. xxviii. 11) ובראשי חדשיכם שלם בינהם פרק פי הדא אלחאב ודוא ואצא. On Ramla see *R. E. J.*, XLVIII, 156, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, p. 31.

the various Karaite views in Aaron b. Elias, *Gan Eden*, fol. 114 b seq.; cf. also *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 233).

23. Another MS. of the same library (MS. Bodl. Heb. d 44, fols. 60-3; Supplement to Cat., no. 2624<sup>11</sup>) contains the fragment of a commentary on passages from Lev. i. 15-xii. 3. This commentary belongs in any case to the older period of Karaite literature, as the Karaite author Abu Sulejmân [David] al-Qumisi is quoted here, who is otherwise almost quite unknown, and is only mentioned by Jefet besides (see *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 681, n. 1; cf. also *R. É. J.*, XLV, 178, 179, and *Jew. Encycl.*, IV, 465)<sup>1</sup>. On iii. 9 (fol. 60 b) Saadiah's interpretation of the words חלבו האליה is cited and thoroughly refuted: ואלפיומי קאל קולה חלבו האליה מעניה חלבו והאליה ואלאליה הו גיר אלחלב וליס אלאמר כמה זעם וקאל אן לנא אדם שט אנש והמא אניאר בלא וו עלי ראם אלכלמה פכילך קולה חלבו האליה מענאה חלבו והאליה אלך. The enjoyment of the fat tail is known to be forbidden by Karaite law, and Saadiah's explanation, taken from his commentary on the passage<sup>2</sup>, is mentioned by many other Karaites, e. g. by Tobias b. Moses (אוצר נחמד, MS. Bodl. 290, fol. 91 a), Hadassi (Alphab. 233, פ; Saadiah's name is not mentioned here), Jacob Tamâni (Pinsker, p. 87), Aaron b. Joseph (*Mibhar*, fol. 5 b; here also Saadiah's name is not mentioned; cf. further, *infra*, Nos. 36 and 46), Aaron b. Elias (*Gan Eden*, fol. 96 c; cf. also his *Keter Torah*, on Leviticus, fol. 8 a), and Elias Bashiatchi (*Adderet*, ענין שחיטה c. 18: here the presentation of reasons and counter-reasons is especially the most complete).

24. MS. Brit. Mus. 2580<sup>2</sup> (Cat. II, no. 587<sup>2</sup>) contains a fragment of an old Karaite Book of Precepts (written throughout in Arabic characters). In one passage (fol. 13 a) is quoted an objection of Saadiah against 'Anân and Benjamin al-Nahawendi with regard to the prescriptions

<sup>1</sup> I have published and translated another passage from this commentary on X, 19 (fol. 62 a) in *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 695, 696.

<sup>2</sup> This follows explicitly from Tobias' words to be mentioned further on. In the section in question of the polemical work against Ibn Saqaweihi (*J. Q. R.*, XVI, 110, 111), this explanation is not to be found.

about menstruating women, which reads as follows<sup>1</sup>:  
 ואעלם אן הפיומי טען על עאנאן ונניאמין וקאל אנהא גזפ (גזפא 1.) אד  
 השרפין ואנהא זכרא אן אל נדה אדא אטל דמהא חסלא (חטלת 1.) זבה פאלגיאהא (?פאליהא 1.)  
 אפטשא קולו בלא עת נדתה (Lev. xv. 25) ושנע עליהא באלק דם עול  
 אעל. על בייאן המראד בקולו בלא עת נדתה אל. The question here dis-  
 cussed is that, according to the Talmudists, ימים רבים in this  
 verse mean "three days," and they refer this verse to the  
 נדה לנדה יום שבין נדה לנדה (see *Sifrā*, ad loc., and *Nidda*, 72). But  
 'Anān explains the verse thus: if a woman, whether within  
 or without the period of menstruation, has a flow of blood  
 more than seven days she must then (in contradistinction  
 to a menstruating woman) count another seven days after  
 her purification, see his words in the original by Harkavy,  
*Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, I, 42: . . . אבל אי חאזיא טפי משבעת ימים  
 מחיבי למספרי שבעה בתר דרביא דכתיב ואשה כי יזוב זוב דמה ימים רבים  
 בלא עת נדתה או כי תזוב על נדתה כל ימ זוב טומאתה כי מי (כימי 1.)  
 נדתה תהיה טמאה [הוא] קא אמא ימים רבים בלא עת נדתה משום דנדה  
 קביע לה שבעה ימי טהרה קא אמא גבי בלא עת נדתה ימים רבים לאודעך  
 דבלא עת נדתה נמי כי חאזיא טפי משבעת ימים הוא דצריכה ספירת שבעה  
 דב' (cf. also *Mibhar* and *Keter Tora*, ad loc.). That Saadiah  
 (probably in the Commentary) combats this view of 'Anān,  
 we also see from the commentary [of David b. Boaz?] on  
 the passage in question (MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2495, Cat.,  
 no. 306, fol. 181 seq.): . . . וקאל ימים רבים קאלו אלרבאנן ימים . . .  
 רבים שלשה . . . וקאל אלפיומי אן הדא אלקול מן אלנבי על אלס לקנהם  
 איאה והו אן ימים רבים ז ועת נדתה פהו בער אלטהר יא כמא קאלו  
 אחד עשר יום שבין נדה לנדה . . . ואעלם אנה חכא ען ענן אן אלנדה  
 אדא נטרת דם אכחזר מן ז והי זבה וק אנה לס יאח בשי אלך.

25. MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2573 and 2574 (Cat. II, nos. 589,  
 590) contains a work on the differences and agreements in  
 the exposition of the laws between Abu 'Ali and Abu-l-

<sup>1</sup> I owe the communication of this passage to the kindness of the  
 Rev. G. Margoliouth. The Hebrew words are here transcribed in square  
 letters.

Surri, i. e. between Jefet b. 'Ali and Sahl b. Maṣṣliḥ : כתאב פיה עיון מא בין אלשיכון אבי עלי ואבי אלסרי רצי אללה ענהמא מן אלכלף פי אלמצות ומא אתפאקא עליה. Here also, according to Margoliouth (*Cat.*, II, p. 180 a), Saadiah is rather often cited, but I have not a single passage before me<sup>1</sup>.

26. Israel b. Daniel<sup>2</sup>, according to Firkowitsch, composed in 1062, at the age of twenty-six, a Book of Precepts, ספר המצות (Arab. or Heb.?), which was preserved in the Karaite synagogue in Damascus. He is mentioned without any further epithet by Jefet b. Ṣagīr; on the other hand, in an alleged book-list of the synagogue named (see Pinsker, p. 174; cf. also p. 94, n. 1), he is designated as ר' ישראל הדיין האסכנדרי בכ"ר דניאל רי"ח, and is said to have

<sup>1</sup> It should, however, be observed that a leaf of this work, which is added to the Catalogue as a facsimile (Plate V), contains a passage that seems to have been directed against Saadiah. Here the argument derived from 1 Chron. xii. 33 for the antiquity of the calculation of the calendar is combated; the same argument is cited and refuted by many Karaite authors (see above, vol. XVIII, p. 231, n. 1), but in the present instance the Gaon is not expressly named but referred to as belonging to the "men of calculation" (אנשי החשבון). I give the passage here, as far as it is contained in the facsimile page of the MS. (fol. 7a), while adding the diacritical points and other signs:—

وقد احتج بعض اصحاب الحساب بقوله ومبني يهودي بينا לעתים  
وتمامه قالوا لما اخبر عنهم انهم علماء بالاوقات وبالنظر فيما يعملونه ישראל وان  
اخوتهم تتبعونهم لم نجد ذلك الا في الاعياد ولما كان الهلال ليس يحتاج الى  
تمييز وانما يحتاج الى حدة بصر ولم يذكر في هذا الموضع ما يقتضى غير  
العلم وجب انه قصد حساب الاعياد واعلم انه اذا استمر ان يكون لهذا القول  
وجه اخر بطل الاستدلال به وقد ندري ان القدماء كانوا يعملون على الهلال  
على ما هو مفصوح به في الـمـشـنـة وان الحساب محدث .... من اصحاب الـلـمـود  
واذا كان كذلك فيجب ان يكون هذا القول انما قصد به الى ضرب اخر من  
العلوم وهو في تدبير العساكر وحوائج الامة مثل ويامر الملوك لخدمتهم  
يودعي . . . .

<sup>2</sup> See on him Steinschneider, *Die arab. Liter. d. Juden*, § 70 (also *ibid.*, p. 342).

lived in Hebron. Moses Bashiatchi calls him 'ישראל בן הח' (read רבי, דניאל הקמחי מחכמי הסתרה (תסתר) and quotes his Book of Precepts under the title 'ברא מצות ה' (Steinschneider, *Cat. Lugd.*, p. 14). He thus regards him as a son of Daniel al-Qumisi (who wrote in the ninth century), and assigns his domicile to Tustar (where Jashar b. Hesed also had his home). But all these statements, especially that of his home, are very doubtful, and those of Firkowitsch seem to have been specially concocted<sup>1</sup>. If Israel b. Daniel flourished in the second half of the eleventh century, then he might be identical with an Israel b. Daniel al-Ramli, who is mentioned in an anti-Karaite work (composed or copied 1112) as a contemporary (see the passage in question, *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 700: אלי אסראיל בן דניאל הדא אלרמלי). At the top of the Firkowitsch MS. (now in St. Petersburg) of David b. Abraham al-Fâsi's Lexicon there are a few poems with the superscription 'למר' ורב' ישראל הדיין זצ"ל, which may have been composed by Israel b. Daniel (cf. Pinsker, pp. 174 seq.; Firkowitsch, בני רשף, p. 3, and Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, III, notes 94 and 122). The first of these poems is directed against Saadiah, "the erring Fayyumite" (שמאל ילד הפני (השוגה הפיתומי), and Samuel b. Hofni (שמאל ילד הפני), who thought to uproot the creed of the Karaites. From the clumsy form of the poems we might assume an earlier writer; but it is also possible that they originate from Israel ha-Maarabi, who is also called הדיין (see further *infra*, No. 37).

27. Tobias b. Moses, called העובר, הבקי, and also המעתיק, "the translator," as his chief importance consists in his

<sup>1</sup> The communication from the catalogue of books in Damascus seems to have undergone various changes, for the statements that Israel b. Daniel was twenty-six years old at the time the list was made, and that he sojourned in Hebron, occur only in the בני רשף, p. 4, but not in Pinsker [here also there have been added the dates 202 of the Hegira and 745 (of the Creation?), which, however, do not agree with the year 1373, Era of Contracts]. In Ibn al-Hiti (*J. Q. R.*, IX, 432, l. 4 from bottom) it seems that we must really read דניאל instead of ישראל בן דניאל, see *ibid.*, p. 438, n. 1.

numerous translations from the Arabic of works by co-religionists<sup>1</sup>. He is said to have been a pupil of Jeshua b. Jehuda, and lived in the second half of the eleventh century in Constantinople, where the first traces of Karaite literature show themselves in his time. Besides the translations, which he partly curtailed and revised, Tobias also compiled complete works from earlier authors. For example, there is a sort of commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled *אוצר נחמד*<sup>2</sup>, which is compiled chiefly from David b. Boaz (הנשיא) and Jefet b. Ali (המלמד), and to which Tobias made some additions, especially in the form of questions. All that has been preserved, in a Bodleian MS. (Cat. Neub. 290), is the part on Leviticus i-x, from which I have communicated several small and long passages (see *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 697; *R. É. J.*, XXXIV, 167, 181; XLIV, 186).

In the *אוצר נחמד* Saadiah is controverted pretty often, and the name of the Gaon, who is mostly called הפיתומי, is accompanied with nasty expressions (cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.*, 2168), e. g. הבער (MS. fol. 14 b), הזר (90 b, 101 b), הלץ (101 b), התועה (90 a), החועה והמתעה (91 b), הנער המצרי (90 b, 93 b), זה האיש (=היא אלרגל=, 95 b), &c. The questions on which Tobias disputes with Saadiah in the portion preserved are naturally such as are connected with explanations and prescriptions of the Third Book<sup>3</sup>, but in one place (fol. 96 a) there is a controversy especially about the Oral Law, where Saadiah's commentary on Exod. xxiv. 12 is cited: . . . והירישה אשר תזכור אותה היא אצלך המשנה והתלמוד וזולתם מן ספרי הרבנים והדומ' להם כאשר זכר[ת]ו בפתר' פסוק עלה אלי' . . . ההרה והיה שם וכו' (cf. *J. Q. R.*, X, 257, n. 3). The whole of the passage is of a personal character throughout, and we read

<sup>1</sup> See on him lastly Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Übersetz.*, pp. 454 seq., 940 seq., and *Jev. Encycl.*, s. v. (XII, 166).

<sup>2</sup> That this work extended to the entire Pentateuch I gather from the words of Tobias: אני מביא . . . כתבתי זה הספר שהוא א' מספרי אוצר הנחמד והוא: סדר כהנים וכו'.

<sup>3</sup> The polemical passages also Tobias doubtless took for the most part from his sources, but unfortunately the sources bearing on this particular part of Leviticus are not accessible to me.

here : "If thou (Saadiah) and thy followers maintain that Mishna and Talmud were dictated word by word by God to Moses, then do I say that thou liest and deniest what is manifest (רע כי זה שקר אהא מתנבא אי נבל וכפרת ושכחת לדברים), as these works contain the dicta of individuals and events from the time of the second temple and still later."

In the province of ritual law, Tobias discusses very often and very thoroughly two questions especially. In the first place, that on the operation of מליקה (ff. 6 a-7 b and 37 a-39 b)<sup>1</sup>; according to Saadiah this took place before the slaying of the sacrificial bird, and its process does not rest upon scriptural demonstrations, but upon continuous statements of eye-witnesses (fol. 7 a: כי . . . ואמ' סעדיה הפיתומי . . . המליקה מעשה יעשהו הכהן בעוף קודם השחיטה . . . ואמ' סעדיה הפיתומי כי אש' אמרו זה הדבר אין להם ראיה על זה הדבר בדבר מן הכת' אבל הם ; מדרך ההעתקה מן המספרים ומגידים מה שראו בעיניהם מן המעשה וכו' . . . similarly fol. 37 b). Tobias then proves from Sifrâ on I, 15 (fol. 37 b: כי הרבנים אמ' בתו' כהנים בפתרון והקריבו הכהן אל המזבח : [וידן] הוא וכו' . . . כי כן אמ' בפרק הששי : *ibid.* : cap. VI (ibid. : *Zebahim*, cap. VI (ibid. : see ed. Weiss, fol. 8 d) and from Tosefta, *Zebahim*, cap. VI (ibid. : see ed. Zuckermann, p. 489, where our passage is VII, 4), that the Talmudists seek a support in the Scriptures for their opinion, and that Saadiah deviates from them and contradicts them. In any case, the argument of the Talmudists is also not valid. Tobias also cites on this occasion Saadiah's commentary on Leviticus (fol. 38 a: ואמ' זה פיתומי : (בחלק הג' מן חלקי הקרבנות אשר זכר בפתרון שלו בספר ויקרא

The second question is that on the enjoyment of the fat tail (אליה), which forms a constant theme in Karaite polemics. Tobias also devotes much space to it (ff. 90 a-94 a, 95 b, and 99 a-99 b). Saadiah's reasons and the counter-reasons of the Karaites are the same here as in the

<sup>1</sup> For the various Karaite opinions on this subject, see the passages quoted in *R. É. J.*, XL, 196, 197.

other sources hitherto known elsewhere (see above, No. 23), but expressed much more passionately and often more thoroughly. It is interesting to establish that all Saadiah's reasons and objections are taken from his commentary on Leviticus, and that here also is mentioned the explanation of חלבו האליה mentioned above (fol. 90 a : מקצת יע' מקצת : הרבנים [= בעץ אלרבאנין] בפתורנו לס' ויקרא נבאר בזה המקום אש' בדא מלבו מקצ' הקושרים בדורנו זה והם כי אמ' כי האליה אסור אכילתם [אכילתה 1]. . . . אמ' הפיתומי ואני אגלה שבושם ושגיונם בזה הפרק . . . ואם יאמרו כי התורה אמרה חלבו האליה תמימה יש לנו יכולת למנעם ממנו מב' פנים הראש' שנ' להם יתכן להיות שאמ' חלבו האליה חלבו והאליה תמימה בתוספת אות וי"ו . . . לאש' מצאנו העמרניים [?] יע' כתבי הקדש כי יחברו בלא וי"ו כמו שכת' אדם שת אנוש ומענהו . . . ודעו כי זה האיש [=הוא אלרגל] : then fol. 95 b : אדם ושת ואנ' וכו' א' בחלק הי"ז [מ'חלקי הקרבנות אשר זכר אותם בפתרון הפרק הראשון (מן פרש' ויקרא כאשר חלק הקרבנות לשריפה ג' חלקי' וכו' Tobias also quotes from Saadiah the well-known opinion of Meswi al-Okbari, that only the fat of offerings was forbidden, and he spurns in indignant and abusive terms the insinuation of the "frivolous Fayyumite" (זה הפיתומי הלין), as if the Karaites also follow the opinion of Meswi (ff. 101 b-102 a)<sup>1</sup>.

Finally, Tobias controverts the following explanations of Saadiah of single passages in Leviticus: (1) on ii. 1 (fol. 8 b), on the amount of oil to be used with a meat-offering; (2) on ii. 14 (fol. 14 b). The offering of firstfruits mentioned here is not the obligatory offering of barley-sheaves, but a private and free-will offering that everybody can bring from the firstfruits of his field products. Tobias cites here Saadiah's interpretation, and the refutation in the name of Jefet : ואמ' יפת המלמד ז"ל ואם תקריב מנחת בכורים לי' :

<sup>1</sup> Cf. detailed treatment in *R. É. J.*, XXXIV, 164. Saadiah does not give the name of Meswi here, but says : . . . ושמענו כי אנשים היו בתוך האומה מתירים : החלבים בדורנו ואמ' כי י"ו חש' אמ' כי כל אכל חלב מן הבהמה אש' יקריב ממנה ואלה הבהמות הקרב מהם דבר אמרו וכן היה הדרך בומן שהמקדש קיים כי הראש אש' היה יקריב לז' חלבו אסור ואש' אינו נקרב חלבו מיותר וכו'.



זכר מנחת בכורים מופרדה מן המנחות המוקדמי' לב' דברים הא' כי היא מן זרע החרש ואם [ואלה 1.] יהיו מן הישן ומן החרש והב' כי היא מובא מן אלבפור לבד . . . ובזה המע' טעות גדול' מי שאמ' כי זאת המנחה תעשה מעומר התנופה . . . כי לא תצא זאת המנחה מג' פנים . . . אמ' המלמד ז"ל לו היה יודע הפיתומי הבער כי הבכורים לא יהיו לכל א' וא' וכי יבכר זרע של זה [היום] ומחר לאחר . . . לא היה מחלק זה החלק וכו'.

Both Karaites overlooked the fact that Saadiah here follows the explanation of the Talmudists (see *Sifrá*, ad loc.).

(3) On iv. 13 (ff. 22 b, 29 a, and 29 b; in the MS. the leaves are here wrongly bound), respecting the question, who is to be understood here by the "congregation of Israel," Tobias indulges in exclamations against the shepherds, i. e. against the leaders of the Rabbanites, who allow what is forbidden and forbid what is allowed. (4) On vii. 12 (fol. 117 b), against the assertion that both the shew-bread and the loaves brought with a thank-offering and a Nazarite offering and the Omer—all belong to meat-offerings. The source is here also Saadiah's commentary on Leviticus: ודע כי מקצ' הרבנים הזכיר בפת' ספר ויקרא שלו והוא סעיד הפיתומי כי לחם הפנים והלחם אשר יוקרב עם התודה ואשר יוקרב עם שלמי נזיר והעומר הוא מן המנחות וכו'.

28. A Karaite compilation on Exodus and Leviticus in Hebrew exists in a Leyden MS., (Cod. Warn. 3), and is identical with the St. Petersburg MS. (No. 588), described by Pinsker (pp. 71 seq.) and Harkavy (*Stud. u. Mitt.*, VIII, 1, 136). It doubtless originated in Byzantium, because it contains Greek words (see e. g. Pinsker, p. 73, l. 2 from bottom); as date of compilation is given 1020 since the destruction of the second temple and 480 of the Hegira, i. e. 1088<sup>1</sup>. The latest Karaite author mentioned by name is Abu Jaqûb, probably Joseph al-Basîr, but the compiler used

<sup>1</sup> So rightly in Pinsker, p. 75: ומלכים עד עתה אלף . . . ואחריהם קמו אדומים . . . וכו' שנים . . . ומן החזברה מלכות ישמעאל מלכה עד עתה ח"ס שנה (see also p. 76, l. 3). In the Leyden MS. (cf. Cat. Steinschneider, p. 7) erroneously 1000 and 380, which together does not at all agree (1000 from the Destruction = 1068, and 380 of the Hegira = 990). Cf. also Geiger, *אוצר נחמד*, IV, 26.

Jeshua and Tobias also <sup>1</sup>. It is also not impossible that the above date (and the Greek words too) was simply taken from some older source, and thus our compilation is possibly of later origin. Saadiah is cited here a few times and controverted, and among other well-known questions (e.g. on לבת אש in Exod. iii. 2, see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 234; on the rejection of the היקש <sup>2</sup>, see above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 230) are mentioned also such explanations of Saadiah as are not known from other sources, e.g. that on Exod. xix. 2 (see Pinsker, p. 72, l. 4), then that a sin-offering must be brought for all involuntary transgressions for which extermination is threatened (*ibid.*, p. 73, l. 10: 'כי אמר פיומי דבר שחייב בורונו כרת יהיה בשגגתו חטאת ולא כן הוא וכו'). A Karaite opinion is falsely given as that of Saadiah, namely, that it is forbidden to enjoy meat in the Diaspora (Pinsker, p. 74, l. 19; Harkavy, p. 138, l. 16: 'לכן פיומי אמר: חייב על ישראל להנזר מאכילת בשר בקר וצאן עד עת הקבוע שישבו חייב על ישראל להנזר מאכילת בשר בקר וצאן עד עת הקבוע שישבו' cf. my remarks in *Monatsschrift*, XXXIX, 443, and *הגרן*, II, 96, 97).

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

<sup>1</sup> For parallels to Jeshua see Pinsker, pp. 76 seq. (who, however, wrongly concluded that Jeshua was the author; cf. also Steinschneider, *Polem. u. apolog. Liter.*, p. 347). From Tobias, e.g., is taken the passage on מליקה (p. 73), where the compiler has combined conclusions found in two widely-separated passages in Tobias (אוצר נחמד, ff. 7 a and 37 a).

<sup>2</sup> In Pinsker, p. 75, l. 6: 'אמר פיומי כי אין מקישין בכל דבר ומצאנו י"ח דברים: מבוארים בחורה וכו' ואמר פיומי כי אני מקיש בכל דבר וכו'.